

Frelinghuysen Laughlin
Frisa Lazio
Funderburk Leach
Gallegly Lewis (CA)
Ganske Lewis (KY)
Gekas Lightfoot
Gilchrest Linder
Gillmor Livingston
Gillman LoBiondo
Goodlatte Longley
Goodling Lucas
Goss Manzullo
Graham Martini
Greenwood McCollum
Gunderson McCrery
Gutknecht McDade
Hall (TX) McHugh
Hancock McInnis
Hansen McIntosh
Hastert McKeon
Hastings (WA) Metcalf
Hayes Meyers
Hayworth Mica
Hefley Miller (FL)
Heineman Molinari
Herger Montgomery
Hilleary Moorhead
Hobson Morella
Hoekstra Myers
Hoke Myrick
Horn Nethercutt
Hostettler Neumann
Houghton Ney
Hunter Norwood
Hutchinson Nussle
Hyde Oxley
Inglis Packard
Istook Parker
Johnson (CT) Paxon
Johnson, Sam Petri
Jones Pombo
Kasich Porter
Kelly Portman
Kim Pryce
King Quillen
Kingston Quinn
Klug Ramstad
Knollenberg Regula
Kolbe Riggs
LaHood Roberts
Largent Rogers
Latham Rohrabacher
LaTourette Ros-Lehtinen

Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo

Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stenholm
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson

Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—11

Collins (IL)
Cox
Farr
Johnston
Moakley
Radanovich
Solomon
Stark
Stokes
Waters
Williams

□ 1208

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1972

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1972.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

REPEALING TEA IMPORTATION
ACT OF 1897

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2969) to eliminate the Board of Tea Experts by repealing the Tea Importation Act of 1897 and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2969

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Federal Tea Tasters Repeal Act of 1996".

SEC. 2. REPEAL OF TEA IMPORTATION ACT OF 1897.

The Tea Importation Act (21 U.S.C. 41 et seq.) is repealed.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2969, the Federal Tea Tasters Repeal Act of 1996. This bipartisan legislation repeals the Tea Importation Act of 1897 by eliminating the Federal Board of

Tea Experts. It was favorably reported by the Committee on Ways and Means on February 29.

This bill ends the antiquated and outdated requirement that each lot of imported tea meet taste standards recommended to the Secretary of Health and Human Services by the Federal Board of Tea Experts.

The bill also ends the imposition of a Customs Service fee on tea imports that partly finances tea quality inspections. The cost to the taxpayer for matching teas to the quality standards of the Tea Board is over \$170,000 each year. Tea is the only food or beverage for which the Food and Drug Administration samples every lot upon entry for comparison to a quality standard recommended by a Federal board.

I believe there is no justification for tea being held to a higher Federal standard on behalf of the tea industry, which should assume responsibility for the competitive quality of its products. The Board of Tea Experts is outdated and the taxpayer's money could be more efficiently used elsewhere.

Under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938, the FDA will continue to examine and sample imported tea for compliance with health and safety standards. The FDA will ensure that tea is held to the same high level of safety and quality as every other food and beverage entering the United States.

I applaud the sponsors of this bill for introducing a measure which strikes a blow for good government by reducing an unnecessary regulatory burden on American industry and the lives of American citizens.

I urge my colleagues to support passage of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE—RETURNING TO THE SENATE S. 1518,
REPEALING TEA IMPORTATION
ACT OF 1897

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House, and I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 387) returning to the Senate the bill S. 1518, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 387

Resolved, That the bill of the Senate (S. 1518) to eliminate the Board of Tea Experts by prohibiting funding for the Board and by repealing the Tea Importation Act of 1897, in the opinion of this House, contravenes the first clause of the seventh section of the first article of the Constitution of the United

NOES—183

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett

Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frank
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)

Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Klecicka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markley
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor

States and is an infringement of the privileges of this House and that such bill be respectfully returned to the Senate with a message communicating this resolution.

Mr. CRANE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution constitutes a question of privilege.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is necessary to return to the Senate the bill S. 1518, because it contravenes the constitutional requirement that revenue measures shall originate in the House of Representatives. S. 1518 would repeal an import restriction found in current law, and therefore contravenes this constitutional requirement.

S. 1518 proposes to eliminate the Board of Tea Experts by repealing the Tea Importation Act of 1897. Under the act, it is unlawful to import to the United States tea which is substandard, and the importation of all such tea is prohibited, except as provided in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

The repeal of this provision would have a direct effect on customs revenues. The proposed change in our tariff laws is a revenue-affecting infringement on the House's prerogatives, which constitutes a revenue measure in the constitutional sense. Therefore, I am asking that the House insist on its constitutional prerogatives.

There are numerous precedents for the action I am requesting. For example, on July 21, 1994, the House returned to the Senate S. 729, prohibiting the import of specific products which contain more than specified quantities of lead. On February 25, 1992, the House returned to the Senate S. 884, requiring the President to impose sanctions, including import restrictions, against countries that fail to eliminate large-scale driftnet fishing. On October 31, 1991, House returned to the Senate S. 320, including provisions imposing, or authorizing the imposition of, a ban on imports in connection with export administration.

I want to emphasize that this action does not constitute a rejection of the Senate bill on its merits. Adoption of this privileged resolution to return the bill to the Senate should in no way prejudice its consideration in a constitutionally acceptable manner.

The proposed action today is procedural in nature, and is necessary to preserve the prerogatives of the House to originate revenue matters. It makes it clear to the Senate that the appropriate procedure for dealing with revenue measures is for the House to act first on a revenue bill, and for the Sen-

ate to accept it or amend it as it sees fit.

□ 1215

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURTON of Indiana). Does any Member on the minority side seek recognition?

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Joint Resolution 165 and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 386, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 165) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of House Joint Resolution 165 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 165

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 104-99 is further amended by striking out "March 22, 1996" in sections 106(c), 112, 126(c), 202(c), and 214 and inserting in lieu thereof "March 29, 1996", and that Public Law 104-92 is further amended by striking out "March 22, 1996" in section 106(c) and inserting in lieu thereof "April 3, 1996".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 386, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. LIVINGSTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I come before the House again today regarding funding for the remaining fiscal year 1996 appropriations bills. I do hope that we will have everyone's help to prevent a Government shutdown and allow the House and the Senate con-

feres on the omnibus wrap-up continuing resolution time to close out this fiscal year and get on with the business of the Congress.

On Tuesday evening, the Senate concluded action on H.R. 3019, the omnibus continuing resolution, making a further downpayment toward a balanced budget. This was a big bill in the House because it addressed big problems. In the Senate it became a bigger bill because they added funding for the District of Columbia as well as providing additional funding, with some offsets, for programs in education and the environment.

We have begun analyzing the differences between the House and the Senate bill, and I might add that the Senate amendment is some 933 pages long, so it has taken us some effort to do so, and we are trying to find out additional offsets to pay for these program increases without exceeding our budget allocations. I have talked with Senator HATFIELD, distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee in that body, and it is our intention to get together informally this afternoon to begin the process of working out the differences between the two bodies on the omnibus bill. Both of us are asking the administration to join with us in concluding the business of fiscal year 1996 so that we can indeed move on to the pending budget for fiscal year 1997.

I might just point out that regardless of what happens on this bill or subsequent ones, by December 31, 1996, this year, the 104th Congress ceases to exist. It is going to be over. And in the interim we have about 4 months that are going to be predominantly taken up by the election season, if you will. So that really only leaves between now and the middle of September for active, ongoing effort to conclude the business of Congress.

We have got lots of policy initiatives to deal with from the authorizing committees, and we have to conclude the fiscal year 1997 appropriations process, which entails 13 bills which must pass the House, pass the Senate, go to conference, pass both Houses again, and be ultimately sent to the President and signed by the President. That means we have a great deal of business to do for fiscal year 1997, and here we are still contemplating the effort in fiscal year 1996, primarily because the President vetoed three of the bills under consideration and because the fourth bill, the Labor-Health bill, languished in the Senate for some 9 months because our liberal friends over there decided to just filibuster it and keep it from coming up for consideration.

In addition, the District of Columbia bill, which should have been sent to the President a month or two ago, was not because of some few Members' concern about a little \$3 million school voucher program which would allow poor youngsters to go to private schools. They do not want to take on the NEA, the National Education Association, and all of those great stalwart protectionist organizations which protect the